DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 230 457 SO 014 650

TITLE	Consultation of Animators of Networks of Educational Innovation for Development. Unesco Conference (Bois du Rocher, September 8-12, 1980). Final Report.
INSTITUTION	United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, Paris (France).
REPORT NO	ED-81/WS/29; ED/SCM/INS/80/9
PUB DATE	29 Jan 81
NOTE	56p.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Comparative Education; *Developing Nations; Educational Development; *Educational Innovation; Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Methods; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; *Networks; Program Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS	Africa; Asia; Caribbean; Central America; Europe (East); United Arab Republic

ABSTRACT

A summary of major concerns of UNESCO's Educational Innovation for Development program in six world regions is presented in this conference report. The conference included educational network participants from Asia, the Caribbean, Southeast Europe, the Arab States, Africa, and Central America. The program encourages innovative educational efforts through networking in dealing with the development process of developing nations. Part 1 of the report provides information on the conference proceedings. Part 2 summarizes the concepts of educational innovation for development, the relationship between the educational system and development, and characteristics of educational development. Part 3 considers common elements in developing evaluation methods for networks in individual regions. A survey form for identifying common elements of each network is included. Part 4 discusses future activities: exchange among networks, an internetwork seminar, and dissemination of the conference report and specific project reports. Appendices provide program reports from each of the six regions, an outline of conference proceedings, a list of participants, and a list of the documents presented. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED/SCM/INS/80/9
Paris, 29 January 1981
Original : English

JAN 26 1983

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Susanne Adlung
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED230457

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

CONSULTATION OF ANIMATORS OF NETWORKS OF EDUCATIONAL INNOVATION FOR DEVELOPMENT

Unesco, Bois du Rocher, 8-12 September 1980

Final Report

SP 014 650

ED-81/WS/29

Table of Contents

		page
I.	Introduction	1
II.	Educational Innovation for Development	4
III.	Common Elements to be considered in developing Evaluation Methods for each Network	13
IV.	Future inter-Network Cooperative Programme Activities for 1981-83	23
	Appendix: Summary of Mutual Presentation of Networks	25
	I. Asian Programme of Educational Innovation for Development (APEID)	26
	II. Caribbean Network of Educational Innovation for Development (CARNEID)	30
	III. Cooperation in Research and Development for Educational Innovation in South-East Europe (CODIESEE)	31
	IV. Educational Innovation Programme for Development in Arab States (EIPDAS)	33
	V. Network of Educational Innovation for Development in Africa (NEIDA)	38
	VI. Network of Educational Systems for Development in Central America and Panama (RED)	43
	Annexes	
	Annex I. Programmes	46
	Annex II. List of Participants and Observers	
	Annex III. List of Documents	

I. INTRODUCTION

Background

1. Since 1973, in accordance with resolutions adopted at successive sessions of the General Conference, Unesco has taken various measures to establish educational innovation networks in Asia and Oceania, Africa, Central America, Europe, Arab States and the Caribbean.

The first cooperative programme was established in Asia in 1973, on the recommendation of the Conference of Ministers of Education and Those Responsible for Economic Planning (Singapore, 1971) to explore new forms for regional cooperation. After the satisfactory start in 1975 of this Asian Programme of Educational Innovation for Development (APEID), Unesco was requested by the Conference of African Ministers of Education in Lagos, Nigeria, in 1976 to establish, with the assistance of UNDP, a similar network for Africa, called Network of Educational Innovation for Development in Africa (NEIDA). This started operation in 1978. In its turn, the Regional Conference of Ministers of Education and Those Responsible for Economic Planning in the Arab States, which took place in Abu Dhabi (United Arab Emirates) in 1977, requested Unesco to set up an Educational Innovation Programme for Development in the Arab States (EIPDAS) which started work in 1978. A subregional cooperative programme involving six South East European Member States (Bulgaria, Greece, Hungary, Romania, Turkey and Yugoslavia) has been operational since 1977 ; Unesco was also responsible for establishing, with UNDP, a subregional network for Central America, including Panama (RED), which has been fully operational since 1975. A subregional Caribbean network (CARNEID), which could associate Member States in that subregion, is at present in the preparatory stage.

2. In conformity with the Unesco Programme and Budget for 1979-80, a consultation of animators of networks of educational innovation for development was organized in the Unesco-owned Chateau of the Bois du Rocher from 8 to 12 Septembre 1980.

3. Terms of Reference

This consultation was expected to serve as a forum for mutual exchange of information, an occasion to increase participants' awareness

of the general aspects of Unesco's programme to support educational innovations for development and to clarify the concept of "educational innovation for development" and to consolidate methodology of evaluation for networks. The agenda of the meeting is in Annex I.

4. Participation

The participants represented different levels of involvement in the above-mentioned cooperative programmes; (1) linkage of information network of different cooperative programmes (2) those who have been closely involved in the establishment and/or the operation of a cooperative network ; ((3) coordinator at the regional or subregional level ; (4) HQ staff involved in conception and preparation of cooperative networks ; (5) HQ staff involved in searching for extra-budgetary funds for cooperative networks. The list of participants and observers is in Annex II.

5. Officers of the meeting

As the meeting was of a very informal nature, the chairmanship was taken by the participants on a rotation basis and no other officers were elected. The first session of mutual presentation of different networks was presided by Mrs. Sutaria (APEID, Philippines) and the second session of the concept of "Educational Innovation for Development" was presided by Mr. Chandler (IBE) ; the third session on evaluation methods for networks by Mr. Hassoun (EIPDAS, Sudan) and the fourth session on common activities for 1981-83 under the Unesco Programme by Mr. Brunswic (HQ).

6. Proceedings of the meeting

The consultation was opened by Mr. H. Foecke, Deputy Assistant Director-General for Education, on behalf of the Director-General and the Assistant Director-General for Education. He welcomed all the participants who, in their different capacities, had contributed to the development of networks. He traced briefly his personal involvement in the development of the first network of educational innovation for development in Asia and repeated his particular interest in the developmental aspect of innovations.

Mr. Foecke recounted the terms of reference of the meeting stressing that this consultation should be a collective reflection and exchange of ideas, experience and questions. He indicated the difficulty in defining educational innovation for development as distinct from educational innovation, and asked the participants to consider the practicality of that distinction.

The working documents were presented by Mr. Brunswic except the special paper on educational innovation for development which was presented by Mr. Berger, consultant (the list of documents is in Annex III). However, it was regretted by several participants that this important paper on "educational innovation for development" was not prepared after consultation with those involved more directly in the problems of innovation and development. These participants pointed out that judging from field experience all educational innovations are linked to national development in developing countries. Therefore, all further consultations should be prepared with the close involvement of each network at different levels.

Following the suggestion of some participants, group discussions were replaced by plenary sessions. Thus the consultation held four plenary sessions in which it considered the various items of the agenda. The closing session on Friday, 12 September 1980, presided by Mr. H. Dieuzeide, Director of the Division SCM, considered verbal reports on the concept of educational innovation for development (presented by Mr. Berger), on evaluation and harmonization of methodologies (presented by Mr. Brunswic) and on a common programme to be undertaken by the networks for 1981-83 (presented by Mr. McLeod). After agreement was reached on the major points mentioned in the verbal reports, Mrs. Sutaria extended gratitude and appreciation to Unesco on behalf of all those actively involved in APEID. Mr. Ogunniyi, Coordinator of NEIDA, thanked the organizers of the consultation on behalf of all the network coordinators and doing so he hilighted the major outcomes of the meeting.

II. EDUCATIONAL INNOVATION FOR DEVELOPMENT

7. "Innovation for Development" was not only the subject of a whole day's discussion, but also a central concern for the inter-network meeting, both during the presentation of individual experiences and the debates on evaluation and modalities of exchange and cooperation.

Discussion of this topic was preceeded by the presentation of the working document ED/SCM/INS/80/3 prepared by the Secretariat. This document did not attempt to propose theoretical views, nor to present a synthesis of the activities of the networks. It merely had three main objectives :

- Taking account of the evaluation of the concept of development and of the theories of innovation, to introduce a discussion on the possibility of determining the specificity of "educational innovation for development" ;

- To provide a pattern for analysis of the objectives of the "networks" and their specificity in relation to other Unesco activities and particularly those of the Regional Offices ;

- Applying an approach derived from systems analysis, to propose a certain number of instruments which could be used for this analysis.

To this end a list of dimensions and corresponding indicators was proposed, which could be applied to the analysis of national situations of countries participating in networks.

Six dimensions were identified relating to

A) the type of development strategy adopted by countries according to the relative importance of transfer of knowledge and technology and "endogenous" initiatives ;

B) how innovations are propagated, distinguishing between a process of extension leading to a form of generalisation (passage from innovation to reform) and a process of induction of new innovations upstream and downstream from the initial innovatory measure ;

C) how educational innovation fits into the development process ;

D) distribution between sectorial innovations and integrating innovations which, from the outset, call upon the various actors in development ;

E) how innovation fits into the educational system, according to which marginal structures (non-formal, adult education, para and peri-education) or the overall educational system, including higher education and research was favoured ;

F) the importance of participation and the tie-in between short-term and long-term objectives (1).

8. The discussion, to which all participants contributed, can be analysed in five separate phases :

A) A discussion of the working document, of its suitability and even of its legitimacy considering the necessary self-determination of the networks.

B) A general discussion on development concepts. educational innovation, educational innovation for development, resulting in a better understanding of some aspects of the relationship between education and development.

C) A more specific analysis in the characteristics proper to what can be considered as "educational innovation for development" according to the different networks and the different countries.

E) Methodological and practical considerations about the management of innovation, resistance and possible deviations.

F) Finally, conclusions or proposals clarifying the specific functions of the networks.

---

(1) cf. Educational Innovation for Development - ED/SCM/INS/80/3/revised

This report deals essentially with points 2, 3 and 5 which were specific contributions to the consultation, taking into account the fact that the production of a general text was not only difficult, but also debatable from the strategic point of view because of the heterogeneity of the networks.

9. Analysis of concepts

This analysis resulted in pinpointing the difficulty of any final definition.

A) Development

There was unanimous agreement to reject all restrictive definitions in terms of economic growth and to include within this concept cultural and social development within the framework of respective national identities, as well as economic development, equity, individual fulfilment, participation of everyone in decision-making and management of development. In this respect, some precisions came to light :

- The concept, and especially the practice of development, cannot be the same in different political systems ;

- The equilibrium of the different aspects of development is bound to overall policies defined by Governments : in this way, very varied development models can be found in the same region or subregion ;

- Stages of development in one region can range from total underdevelopment to post-industrial societies via "unequal or irregular development". Accordingly, the main objectives can be survival, cultural and national identity, social justice, quality of life, etc.

Educational innovation and the role of the networks can only be analysed if these various distinctions are taken into account.

B) Educational innovation

This concept is, in fact, relative in two ways :

- It is relative from one country to another because what is new to one country can be normal and generalised in another ;

- It is relative in that it represents a change which may be of a different nature and more or less effective. In certain cases, innovation is nothing more than the re-establishment of an equilibrium which has been upset due to changes in the social system ; in others, it is the function of the educational sub-system within society which is modified.

The development aspect of implementing innovation was also emphasized. In other words, an innovation is born, develops, can also deviate, and die out. In becoming generalised, does an innovation cease to be an innovation ?

In any case, according to its extension and the phase during which it is considered (when it appears, when it has been recognised, etc.) the questions to be raised cannot remain the same. It can be questioned if the innovative character of any so called "innovative institution" is to be considered as being permanent.

Finally, many participants argued against the validity of a specific concept of "educational innovation for development". It could, in some ways, be considered that any educational innovation contributes in one way or another to development.

However, there was agreement to make the following distinctions :

- between (a) innovations which aim at increasing the effectiveness of the educational system, and
(b) those which only contribute to development by means of developing the educational system, and
(c) those which aim directly at overall development

- between (a) innovations expressed in terms of "problem-solving" or of "modernisation" which are ways of adapting to a development or a change which has already taken place, and
(b) those which are the prime movers (or initiators) of development.

C) The educational system and development

The relationship between the educational system as a whole and development certainly needs further investigation.

Even when seen within its widest sense, the educational system is only a sub-system of society and, therefore

- the transformation of the educational system is more the product of overall development than its origin ;

- the promotion of educational innovations for development is an attempt to make them have a bearing upon the whole system by modifying one particular part. This is possible insofar as education as a sub-system has relative autonomy and can exercise a critical and, thus, a dynamic function in relation to the overall system, but this limits the effective weight of these innovations.

The relative autonomy of the educational sub-system as it operates in co-ordination with other sub-sectors with an integrated approach, was discussed.

10. Finally, the multiplicity of functions of the educational system was stressed. This system has, simultaneously, the functions of reproduction (social reproduction, reproduction of élites, transfer of traditional values) and those of change within this context. Some educational innovations can, in fact, tend to strengthen social reproduction, others, particularly those which take place in non-formal sectors, can result in protecting the existing system and allow it to perpetuate itself within a changing world.

- in a country which is under the cultural domination of another, an increase in the effectiveness of the educational system can contribute to the destruction of national identity ;

- the production of élites modelled upon a foreign example can speed up the brain drain ;

- rural depopulation can be accelerated by certain developments in education and schooling, if it transmits primarily urban values.

Therefore, actual priority objectives in developing educational system can be different from the objectives of socio-economic and cultural development.

It is thus difficult to equate educational innovation to innovation for development.

II. Characterisation of educational innovation for development

Several proposals were made in line with the characteristics of either the networks or specific countries. These proposals modify and complete the dimensions which were set out in the preparatory document.

Generally speaking, it can be considered that innovation appears either as (a) the start of a new activity or

(b) as an acceleration of an existing process or

(c) as the reorientation of an activity whose exclusive objective is the development of the educational system.

The conclusions of the consultation on this point can be grouped under five main headings :

A) Change of strategy or objective

Educational innovation for development and innovation in general can also be defined as an alternative strategy to solve given educational problems and as a change in educational objectives.

B) Overall development and sectorial developments

Every social practice and every change aim at development - in education, production, improvement of health, distribution of culture. However, the pursuit of a specific result might involve the risk of forgetting what is, in effect, the overall development aim. For example,

in order to bring a campaign for inoculation to a more speedy, successful conclusion, training and associating people in decision-making, might tend to be neglected. An innovation for development should take into account the development process according to all the sectorial dimensions previously mentioned, over and above specific developments.

C) Acceptance

The notion of educational innovation for development can only be feasible within the context of a national policy ; innovation is only possible insofar as political willingness exists and can only be understood within a concrete socio-political background. This characteristic does not prevent certain common values being recognised, but does show that change per se may not have any real significance. This entails important consequences for the establishment of any evaluative tool.

D) Complexity

Educational innovation for development should only be proposed if all the dimensions and, consequently, all the actors in development, are present from the outset. Any attempt to solve problems of an economic, cultural and social nature from an educational point of view, would result in failure and, in consequence, not solve the problem raised if the actors in these various dimensions do not participate from the beginning. This implies their direct participation and permanent knowledge of what is going on in developing innovation. Because of their multi-dimensional nature, because of the number of actors intervening, because of their integration within a certain socio-cultural and policial context, activities of this kind are too complex to be described in reports ; they disaggregate whenever discussed from afar and to understand, one needs to participate and to grasp the interaction of all factors.

E) Dynamics

Several remarks can be grouped under this heading :

- Innovation within a given system always appears as a more or less radical criticism of what exists. It thus has a polemic value and cannot be developed if there is no political willingness. In addition, innovation comes up against many obstacles -certainly resistance to change- but also resistance on the part of all institutions to everything that contests or criticises them.

- Innovation is essentially a temporal process (as is development) ; it begins, matures, declines.

An innovation can, in some cases, be fundamental and provisory at the same time : a literacy campaign would be useless after achievement of total schooling ; using monitors instead of qualified teachers, calling upon mass communication media to overcome a shortage of educational personnel, can be innovations which fade away simply because of their success. If it is sometimes necessary to prevent an innovation from dying out, in other cases, an innovation which has outlived its usefulness should not be perpetuated.

- One of the most interesting aspects of innovation for development is its capacity for self-generation and triggering off multiple -often unforeseen- changes. This is particularly linked to the complexity of the innovation process and above all to the real participation of the different actors and the different sectors.

Management of innovation calls upon a conflicting practice. On the one hand, deviation from or deterioration of a positive change should be mastered and orientation towards the objectives safeguarded. On the other, the innovative process should not be constrained by applying too rigourous control practices, nor should participation of the various actors and the continuous generation of new changes be limited.

Along these lines, several participants preferred the term "innovative project" to that of "innovative process" in order to show the political dimension and the capacity for self-renewal.

Since a project remains innovative if it shows the capacity for self-renewal, an important characteristic of an innovative project is its built-in evaluation and renewal mechanisms.

12. A few conclusions about the role of the networks

The role of the networks was not the central point of the discussion, but an examination of the specificity of educational innovation for development lead to a certain number of proposals being made on these roles.

Besides communication and mutual exchange of information, which are discussed elsewhere, the following points should be mentioned :

A) The need for self-organisation and self-determination of the networks is one of the outcomes of the analysis of innovations for development. This remark alone enables a radical distinction to be made between the networks and the Regional Offices with whom they work.

B) The critical and polemic character of innovation contributes to accentuating the frailty of innovations. A network thus plays the role of a mutual support system, helping to overcome the isolation in which educational institutions or personnel might find themselves in their own countries.

C) Given the complexity of educational innovation for development and the difficulty of managing it (see above), the networks become a place for mutual learning, sharing of experiences and projects.

With these conclusions, the discussion has contributed to a better understanding of the specificity of educational innovations for development and how the networks function.

13. These conclusions have been used by the Secretariat to revise and improve the working document presented during the consultation (1).

(1) Cf. ED/SCM/INS/80/3/revised.

III. COMMON ELEMENTS TO BE CONSIDERED IN DEVELOPING EVALUATION METHODS FOR EACH NETWORK

14. One of the main concerns of Unesco's programme for 1981-1983 -the last period of the medium term plan- is evaluation. This should also be applied to the networks which, from Unesco's point of view, constitute a global programme aiming at the promotion of educational innovation for development. Participants examined ways and means of rendering evaluation carried out in each network compatible, in order to permit global conclusions.

The discussions were based on two working documents :

ED/SCM/INS/80.4 - Evaluation design proposal for networks of educational innovation for development, prepared by Dr. E.A. Yoloye (University of Ibadan, Nigeria) for the Regional Consultation Meeting of NEIDA in June 1979 ;

ED/SCM/INS/80.5 - Development of guidelines and methods of evaluating the third cycle programme of APEID, prepared by a study group which met in Bangkok in April 1980.

which were examined within the framework proposed by 21C/5 (para 1222) :

"The evaluation activities already undertaken in these networks will be coordinated by an internetwork seminar (Category VII) so as to collate the experience gained and pinpoint the medium and long term implications of economic, social and cultural development as regards both the organization of the networks and the adaptation of educational structures, content and practices"

15. The discussion on harmonization of evaluation procedures was difficult but fruitful :

- On the one hand, the networks are self-directed and self-managed programmes, which have developed their own evaluation mechanisms ; on the other, the autonomy of networks pertaining to a global programme calls for some kind of harmonization.

- Networks are at different levels of development, some entering into their third four-year cycle and others still in their infancy. They differ as to their environment, number of participants, the magnitude of population concerned, so as to render a comparative evaluation meaningless.

An agreement was reached that a clear distinction should be made between information and evaluation. The different partners in the networks -such as institutions, national development groups, Member States, regional coordinating units, funding agencies- have different information needs. These should be provided on a common basis by using the same indicators allowing for objective observation. The treatment of this information for evaluative purposes can be more or less sophisticated according to the needs of each user (management, improvement, justification).

16. This compatibility amongst information systems -the systems can be different- will be achieved by adopting a set of common principles concerning the aims and procedures of evaluation :

A) Transparency : there should be an awareness of the usefulness of the aims of evaluation and information provision from all those who contribute to information exchange.

B) Evaluation activities have three objectives :

i) to inform
ii) to improve
iii) to prove

(a) An objective description of what is going on is a need for all those concerned at different levels : it is a tool of understanding both specificity and common factors for the participating institutions and a basis for international exchange.

(b) Formative evaluation by providing a permanent feedback is an essential tool not only for management, but also for the improvement of the activities and the programme. There should be an in-built evaluation component in each activity.

(c) Summative evaluation should aim at proving the pertinence of networking as a strategy to promote educational innovation for development. To be recognized as worthwhile, the programme has to be convincing of its usefulness, not only for those who participate, but also for outsiders. What is obvious when you are in, can be questionable if you are out.

C) Evaluation must be feasible and reasonable, in terms of time and effort. Institutions and coordinating units should not be overloaded with evaluation work which would be at the cost of execution of the programme activities. Evaluation needs of different partners must be coordinated and be based on common information. This is a matter of management of information : a common base of information and indicators should allow for response to diversified questions and evaluation needs.

D) The scope of evaluation is given by the role of networks : help Member States to improve, develop and disseminate a particular kind of educational innovation -educational innovation for development. It is not to evaluate innovations per se. Promotion of innovation must be seen as a technical activity different from judgement. Evaluation is concerned with the exchange process, circulation of information, products, persons, the nature, quantity, quality and direction of exchanges (vertical, horizontal and two-way communication and exchange procedures in the networks).

E) As to procedures, a common principle should be group-self evaluation or participatory evaluation at each level -institutional, national, sub-regional, regional, e.g.- at the institutional level (participant project) self-assessment by the staff with participation of some representatives of the population who will benefit.

- reciprocal group evaluation between associated institutions in a country ;

- group evaluation by teams formed of representatives of different countries visiting each other, etc.

- self and group evaluation impiies that the criteria used must be specified.

17. On this basis, a consensus was reached on the type of information to be sought and which should be provided by the networks according to their own procedures, viz information relative to three dimensions :

- the profile of institutions and network services of direct concern for exchange ;

- the activities performed by the networks (both types already available in most of the networks) ;

- the environment of networks.

Several participants recalled that participation in a network for a Member State is only one of the modalities for developing educational innovations on a national and an international basis, and pointed out that the importance and relevance of networks has to be seen in the perspective of other Unesco activities in the country and other international cooperative mechanisms (bilateral, multilateral cooperation, regional governmental and non-governmental organisations, etc.).

A new list of common information required was elaborated on this basis as a draft proposal to be discussed and improved upon by the networks at the different levels concerned (see : common information to be provided by the networks). The participants stressed the evident fact that the quality of such an information basis is directly related to the accuracy of information provided at each level.

18. Concerning the evaluation of some particular aspects, it was proposed to generalize the procedure of in-depth studies, a modality already used in some networks. These in-depth studies, one or two per cycle, should be related to ascertained evaluation needs in areas in which more information, mainly of a qualitative nature, is needed. They should not be decided upon only on the basis of the importance of a given activity. In-depth studies should stem out of the needs of the programme, be defined by regional consultation meetings and be seen as a complementary procedure in the evaluation process. It was clearly stressed that these studies should therefore be selective, there being no need to study simultaneously all aspects of a programme.

The participants were of the opinion that the question of a common information element as a basis for compatible evaluation procedures should now be further discussed by national development groups and regional consultation meetings in order to prepare an inter-network seminar which is planned for early 1982.

Common information to be provided by the networks

0. Network general characteristics

0.1	Number of participating countries	representing a population of
0.2	Number of associated projects/centres	
0.3	Maximum distance between centres	a) N - S b) E - W
0.4	Official language(s) of the network	Number of official languages spoken in the area of the network

1. Institutions profile

1.1 Identification

Official name	translation
Address	
Telephone	
Year of creation	
Parent organization	or administrative body
Present director	or responsible for correspondence
Size of staff	of which professionals
Total man-weeks devoted to network activities per year	
Date of Entry to the Network	

1.2 Scope of responsibility

Domain of responsibility (e.g. curriculum development, instructional material design, teacher training, rural education, planning)

Clientele

1.3 Innovative projects developed by the institutions within the network

Already completed	title	objective
	availability of materials - language	
On-going projects	title	objective
	availability of materials - language	
Planned projects	title	objective
	availability of materials - language	

1.4 Expertise available and offered (specify staff number and man-months of availability)

Areas

Skills

1.5 Expertise requested

Areas

Skills

1.6 Information in the form of pamphlets, manuals etc., produced within the framework of the networks

At national level

At regional or sub-regional level

2. Network profile

2.1 National development group/coordinating units

2.1.1. Identification

Name | Address | Telephone

Head or responsible for correspondence

Administrative status

Origin of participants | education - formal, non-formal
health
development workers

Man-weeks devoted to network activities

2.1.2 Other international cooperation in the field of network activities

- With other Unesco programmes
- With other UN organizations (UNDP, UNICEF, FAO, WHO, World Bank, supported projects)
- With other cooperative settings (regional organizations, bilateral agreements, foundations)

2.2. Regional Coordinating Unit

Size of staff | of which | professionals

Total amount of resources (irrespective of origin)

Activities by modalities a) on-going b) new

- publications - studies
- seminars
- internship and study tours
- joint research projects

3. Participation in network

3.1. Changes in number of associated projects/centres

3.2. Rate and extent of participation in activities by each country

3.3. Origin of participants - which centre - new, old

3.4. Reactions of participants or centres to network activities - useful, not useful, suggestions for improvement

3.5. What are the follow-up activities at country level (publications, training, etc.)

- intended

- undertaken

4. Flow of exchanges

	NATURE			
Direction	materials	persons	Information n° of items	Information n° of copies
Regional centre to centres/ projects				
Projects/centres to regional centre				
Between projects inside country				
Between projects between countries				

5. Other information

5.1. Increases in innovative capacity

5.1.1. Number of persons having benefitted from training

- directly through network
- as organised by associated projects/centres

5.1.2. Changes in associated projects/centres

	increase	decrease
- by areas of operation of the network		
- by increase in variety of innovative projects		

5.2 Increase in joint experimentation amongst countries

IV. FUTURE INTER-NETWORK COOPERATIVE PROGRAMME ACTIVITIES FOR 1981-83

19. Decisions for future action were taken on the following five topics :

A) Kinds of exchange

It was agreed that the needs for exchange amongst the networks in the coming triennium will be assessed, together with the resources available for this exchange in each of the respective regions. Three basic types of future exchange were decided upon :

a) a direct exchange of publications between the respective networks ;

b) an exchange of information through articles on other networks in the individual network bulletins ; and

c) exchanges of personnel whenever possible through the participation of relevant network staff in the various network meetings (e.g. regional consultative meetings), and in the programme activities of other networks.

B) The Inter-Network seminar (scheduled for early 1982)

This seminar will be prepared by Unesco Headquarters, and might be hosted by EIPDAS at UNEDBAS in Beirut, subject to UNEDBAS' invitation. The following items will be included on the seminar's agenda : focus of interest of programme areas ; evaluation activities ; alternative structures for networks (comprising the information services of national development groups ; plans of exchanges ; and intra and inter country activities) ; cooperation between networks ; the respective role and relationship of Unesco Headquarters, the IBE, the General Information Programme Division (PGI), and the Regional Offices in information dissemination ; educational innovation and development ; and network activities within the context of Unesco's prospective programmes. A small technical meeting will be held as soon as possible to prepare this seminar.

C) Dissemination of the results of the Bois du Rocher consultation

A final report on the consultation will be prepared by Unesco Headquarters and then sent to the Regional Offices, who will be responsible for distribution at the national level, and for increasing national awareness of the consultation's main points and conclusions.

D) Project information

In addition to providing for improved distribution of project information, it was also decided to have more direct contacts with Member States in order to obtain information not only on successes but also, and perhaps more important, on project failures and how to avoid them -information which usually does not appear in the official documentation that is distributed.

E) Studies scheduled in 1981-83 (21C/5, para 1222)

These studies will be entrusted to the Regional Offices and/or the Regional Network Coordinators, as they have had actual experience in the subject areas of the proposed studies. These studies will be further discussed in the small technical meeting that will prepare the inter-network seminar.

APPENDIX

Summary of mutual presentation of networks

I. Asian Programme of Educational Innovation for Development (APEID)

Mr. A. Latif, Chief of ACEID, reviewed the significant events and actions in the history of the Programme as follows :

Regarding the birth of the programme, he mentioned that the Fifth Regional Conference of National Commissions for Unesco, in 1970 (Tehran), recommended that the Director-General of Unesco review, with the help of Asian consultants, Asia's emerging needs to determine whether a "new pattern of collaboration" would be of interest to the Member States. In response, a regional seminar was convened in 1971 (Chiang Mai, Thailand), which recommended that the regional cooperation to be established should be a "means of pooling efforts, of sharing risks and comparing information on the efforts of experimentation", and identified areas of concern to the Member States, of which the common thread was "educational innovation for development". Highest importance was to be attached to the national institutions which had already acquired a considerable measure of strength and to the mobilisation of their capabilities for regional cooperation. The report of the seminar was considered by the Third Regional Conference of Ministers of Education and Those Responsible for Economic Planning in Asia, the same year, which recommended to Unesco the establishment of the Programme and of a regional mechanism to support and intensify national efforts. The Seventeenth session of Unesco's General Conference (Paris, 1972) endorsed both the Programme, later to be called Asian Programme of Educational Innovation for Development (APEID) and the mechanism to be set up as an integral part of the regional office, called ACEID. The Director-General established ACEID and addressed letters to the Member States to ascertain their interest in the Programme and receive offers of Centres for association with 17 members joining the Programme and with only 12 national institutions associated with the Programme, APEID became operational in 1974.

As to the progress of APEID over the years, the Programme completed the first cycle of its operations in 1977, and should complete the second cycle at the end of 1981. Each year, until 1980, a Regional consultation meeting has been held, at which Chairmen of the National liaison agencies, called National Development Groups, and selected heads of associated national institutions, called, Associated Centres have met, reviewed past year's activities and planned for the following

year and at the same time undertaken in-depth review of the various aspects of the Programme, modes of operation, institutional mechanisms, etc. As of September 1980, 21 countries are in this Programme, with 90 Associated Centres, some of which are sub-regional, but most are national. The programme promotes and stimulates innovations in the areas of new structures and non-formal education, educational administration and management, curriculum development, educational technology, training of educational personnel, science education and vocational and technical education, with emphasis on inter-disciplinary activities to enable Member States to enhance contributions of their educational systems to their own self-identified goals, such as rural development, productive skills, better health and nutrition, universalisation of early stage of education, national unity and international understanding. Particular emphasis is laid on commitment, participation and leadership, use of local resources and low-cost instructional methods, endogenous development, meeting the needs of disadvantaged groups. Since 1980, research base for educational reforms and concerted efforts to use the resources of the Associated Centres to train each other's staff in critical skills have emerged as the dominant new emphases.

The Programme ensures that it concentrates on the problems which the countries find in trying to achieve their national goals, through educational innovation and the outcomes of the activities are fed back into the stream of national actions. The financing of the programme is shared amongst Unesco, UNDP and Member States, prominently Japan. The bulk of cost is met through contributions in kind and through free services provided by the countries and their associated institutions.

Towards the Third Cycle of the Programme : The Fourth Conference of the Ministers of Education and Those Responsible for Economic Planning in Asia and Oceania (MINEDASO IV) meeting in Colombo in 1978 recommended the continuation of this programme beyond the Second cycle and made suggestions on expanding participating in and scope of the programme. The Sixth Regional Consultation Meeting of APEID (1979) and a study group suggested by the former, meeting in 1980, provided guidelines on the scope and design of the third cycle. An advisory committee on regional cooperation, established in October 1979 after the recommendation of the Fourth Regional Conference of Ministers of Education

and Those Responsible for Economic Planning in Asia and Oceania suggested a nine-problem area programme for the third cycle of APEID.

Following this action, discussions were held between Unesco and UNDP and a draft project document on the third cycle 1982-1982 prepared for consideration and approach . Reproduced below are the characteristics of the third cycle as well as areas of emphasis which could be observed :

First, the Programme has been, and should remain, in constant evolution. Built-in evaluation in all its methods of work and activities, the flexibility of APEID's design, and the mechanisms and processes which have been instituted should be further strengthened, in order to ensure even more prompt responsiveness of the Programme to the emerging developmental concerns in the participating countries.

Second, the principle that the Member States jointly design, execute, supervise and evaluate the Programme, and that relationships among them are based on reciprocity for mutual learning and self-reliance, needs to be emphasized. Any change in the mechanisms and methods of work should be aimed at progressive approximation to these ideals.

Third, the Programme has stressed and should continue to emphasize that a strategy of education for development requires that a selective approach be adopted towards possible innovations. APEID should therefore encourage the Member States to identify and undertake innovations which respond to well-defined and high priority needs as identified by them and accordingly participate in relevant APEID activities.

Fourth, the Programme should help build national capacities for undertaking coordinated sets of changes in the educational system, such that these are contributory to realizing national development goals. In this process, it should be borne in mind that educational changes are a component of, and need to be integrated into, broader development processes. This follows from a clear recognition of the multi-dimensional nature of development.

The Committee recommended that, within the above framework, special emphasis should be placed on strengthening national capabilities in :

(a) anticipatory planning relating to innovations linked with development ; (b) development of professional support services in innovations ; (c) policy oriented, experimental and developmental research including evaluation ; (d) enhancing the relevance and contribution of education to other development sectors (for instance, agriculture or health).

II. Caribbean Network of Educational Innovation for Development (CARNEID)

Mr. George Young, Unesco Headquarters, referred to the rational behind the creation of networks, the unique, endogenous nature of each network and the possible danger of the networks becoming too rigid and unchangeable. He outlined the unusual nature of the Caribbean which comprised a huge geographical area consisting of a multitude of small even tiny islands with very sparse populations. The problems of small population density, the open and vulnerable economies of the islands, the lack of sufficient infrastructures all presented a challenge for economic development programmes. To innovate in such a mosaic of isolated, heterogeneous socio-cultural entities required a completely new approach to networking.

The Caribbean Network of Educational Innovation for Development (CARNEID), because of the unusual socio-economic and geographical features outlined should be envisaged as a framework within which an inventory of on-going or proposed development programmes would be encouraged through the setting up of channels of communications, exchange of information and documentation and, at a later stage, technical know-how. This rather flexible, non-institution building mechanism would provide viable channels for promoting inter-country technical co-operation as well as providing a point-of-entry for existing sub-regional governmental bodies interested in educational development.

At the first expert meeting on CARNEID held in Paramaribo, Suriname, in mid-1979, the Member States reiterated their support for CARNEID and selected four main programme areas for development : the contribution of education to work ; the contribution of education to cultural identity ; the contribution of education to community development and educational planning and management. Initially, two areas will be developed through an exchange of information and documentation : planning and administration and education and work. It is hoped to have limited funding assistance from UNDP during 1980-81.

III. Cooperation in Research and Development for Educational Innovation in South-East Europe (CODIESEE)

The programme of Cooperation in Research and Development for Educational Innovation in South-East Europe (CODIESEE) was presented by Mr. Isaksson, coordinator of this programme.

CODIESEE is a relatively recent undertaking. The decision to launch it was made by the Nineteenth Session of the General Conference of Unesco in 1976 at the initiative of the countries concerned. The first planning meeting of national experts was held in 1977. The network involves the following six countries of the South-East European subregion : Bulgaria, Greece, Hungary, Romania, Turkey and Yugoslavia. The network is open for participation by other countries of the European region.

The coordinator pointed out that in the three-year history of CODIESEE the emphasis on the developmental nature of the educational innovations involved had not been explicit, the concept of development having rather been used in the "R & D" sense of furthering and improving education by an innovative effort.

The consultative body of CODIESEE is a Coordination Group representing the educational authorities and participating research institutions of the member countries. At its last meeting, in April 1980, the Coordination Group selected or confirmed the following topics as guidelines for cooperative action :

1) Principles and objectives of the reform of educational systems.

2) Elaboration and implementation of the reform of basic and post-compulsory education.

3) Interaction between education and work.

4) Educational technology.

The Coordination Group has identified criteria for the selection of cooperative subtopics and activities. Among the criteria, for example, concentration was emphasized at the last Coordination Group meeting, and the number of subtopics for cooperative action was accordingly reduced.

The programme coordinator mentioned the particular importance which was attached to the exchange of information as an aim of the CODIESEE programme. As one means to enhance such an exchange, the Coordination Group has decided to publish a joint network bulletin.

In a reflexion on the main achievements of CODIESEE so far, the programme coordinator concluded that in its first and present phase the cooperative programme had succeeded in arousing considerable interest among educational policy-makers of at least a majority of the participating countries. Among the difficulties or drawbacks hitherto encountered the coordinator mentioned limited financial means, partly due to the lack of responsiveness by the UNDP to the programme so far, and sheer conceptual difficulty of grasping some of the subtler differences in, e.g., the socio-economic and cultural conditions of educational innovation. He also pointed to the possibility for increased efficiency of the international cooperative work of the participating research institutions which could result from their being informed early of the opportunities Unesco's programme might offer for cooperation so that the institutions could, if they so wished, plan in due time for participatory action in their own working plans and budgets.

Referring to the working paper on educational innovation for development (ED/SCM/INS/80/3), the coordinator was of the opinion that the paper contained several useful reference points for the evaluation of CODIESEE programme activities. He also expressed the view that internetwork cooperation -like this seminar- was useful for CODIESEE. As to future perspectives he did not foresee any change in topic or thematic priorities during the next phase of the programme, but rather a more continuous effort for realizing planned action.

Mr. Tzvetkov, in his intervention, emphasized that in spite of different socio-economic contexts, many problems were similar or common to most or all countries of the subregion. As an example, he mentioned that four of the countries were at present engaged in reforming their educational systems, focusing especially on the secondary school level.

He finally pointed out that CODIESEE, unlike most of the other networks, was not administered through a regional office of Unesco, no such office being operated for cooperation at all levels of education in Europe.

IV. Educational Innovation Programme for Development in Arab States (EIPDAS)

Referring to the two documents presented in the consultation on the subject, EIPDAS Coordinator birefed the participants about the programme, its structure, content and progress, in the Arab region. He emphasized the following points :

a) The growing need of the Arab member states to renovate their educational systems and their interest in the programme.

b) The concern of the programme, in its objectives and activities, to gear educational innovation to development.

c) The selection of programme areas and foci of interest within them on a through analysis of the educational situation in the Arab region and the identification of "bottlenecks" which the educational systems are suffering from, mainly in their relation to socio-economic development.

d) The importance in the strategy of developing the Programme of principles such as : strengthening the Network Associated Institutions, focussing on innovational practices rather than theory and research, involving sub-regional and regional networks in the programme, developing systematic contact with other regional educational innovation networks and emphasizing participation in planning programme activities and their implementation.

e) The full support that UNEDBAS and Unesco has given to the programme despite the difficulties it has been encountering, particularly those relating to financing from extra-budgetary funds.

EIPDAS Coordinator also expressed his view that the conceptual design of EIPDAS, as presented in the documents, has been influenced by two trends or approaches : (a) the rational endeavour to respond to "reality" and to fully tailor the programme according to the needs and possibilities of the Arab region and the new demands of the age ; and (b) the easy temptation to follow other patterns developed in other similar regions, as Asia and Africa. Within this framework he raised a number of questions related to the general structure and content of

the programme such as :

- why associated institutions exclusively governmental, and not innovate individuals ?

- why "centres of excellence" in the Programme and not "infant institutions" as well ?

- why the involvement of "traditional research centres" ?

- why cut-and-dried modalities and modes of operation ?

- why extra-budgetary funds from UNDP in the Arab region ?

- why educational innovation for development and nothing but development in a particular sense ?

- why educational innovation and nothing but innovation despite the ambiguity of the term and/or reluctance to it ?

- why an educational innovation network and not an educational innovation club, forum, "bank", or "trust" ?

The coordinator anticipated that the reality on its move towards the future will create alternative patterns for the functioning of the Programme.

3. Last, the coordinator called the attention to the measures taken in 1980 by Unesco, mainly through its regional office, in order to launch the Programme. These measures are presented in UNEDBAS document and which are as follows :

a) Regarding the Establishment of the Regional Co-ordination Unit

(i) Unesco took preliminary steps to appoint a programme co-ordinator. This post and the administrative services related to it were included in the draft programme and budget for the years 1981-83. At the same time, the Head of the Centre of Educational Planning and Administration in Unesco Regional Office was charged to work, in

addition to his main responsibilities, as programme co-ordinator until the post is occupied. Unesco Regional Office for Education in the Arab States has given all possible help to serve the programme during 1980 as it already did in the past two years.

(ii) The Office started to build an information base related to educative innovation to serve as a centre for information related to the Regional Co-ordinating Unit. Due to these temporary arrangements, the programme could implement to a great extent the plan which was adopted by the First Consultative Meeting for the year 1980.

b) Regarding Field Visits and Identifying National Institutions Associated with the Programme

(i) The Office held two sub-regional meetings. The first (28 April-1st May 1980) was attended by five of the high level officials of the Ministries of Education (Democratic Republic of Sudan, Yemen Arab Republic and the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen). The representative of Somalia was unable to attend the first meeting, but attended the second meeting that was held during 12-15 May 1980. This second meeting was attended by nine high level officials in Ministries of Education and educational institutions in Syria and Lebanon (in addition to Somalia).

(ii) UNEDBAS experts and consultants undertook field visits to twelve Arab States. These are the following (arranged according to time schedule) : Qatar, United Arab Emirates, Bahrain, Morocco, Kuwait, Jordan, Egypt, Tunisia and Iraq. The purpose of the visits was to identify the institutions and educational projects concerned with education innovation and willing to be associated with the Network ; and to identify the activities that could be undertaken at the local, regional

and sub-regional level during the coming years within the framework of the Network.

The concern of the Arab States regarding the establishment of the Network and their readiness to co-operate positively in its activities were clearly shown in the meetings and visits. Discussions have led to the identification of the educational institutions and projects that expressed their wish to be associated with the Network at the first stage of its establishment. This, in addition to identifying a number of sub-regional activities that certain educational institutions showed willingness to undertake within the framework of the Network.

c) Regarding the Survey on Educational Innovative Practices and Projects in the Arab States and Other Studies Related to the Subject

(i) UNEDBAS made a relatively comprehensive survey of educational innovations that will appear in a report entitled "New Trends in Education in the Arab Region".

(ii) In addition to the general survey, UNEDBAS, with the help of some experts working in the field of education in the Arab States, is preparing a group of studies (mainly case studies) that are closely related to the six areas of the programme.

(iii) In addition to the selections published in "L'Education Nouvelle" especially under the title of documents and studies, UNEDBAS undertook the translation of some international experiments in educational innovation as far as EIPDAS programme is concerned. Among these are experiments in basic education.

d) Publicity and Information about the Programme

(i) EIPDAS first newsletter appears end of September 1980. The second newsletter is planned to appear before end of December (after the Second Consultative Meeting).

(ii) In addition to the newsletters, the Office published a special issue of its review "Education Nouvelle" (issue N° 10), which included the Working Document and Final Report related to the establishment of the programme since the beginning of the project and until its adoption in the First Regional Consultative Meeting held in Doha, Qatar (21-26 April 1979). It also included articles on regional co-operation in the field of educational innovation for development from the point of view of Unesco, the relationship between educational innovation and development, and the role of the International Bureau of Education in the field of educational innovation. A section of the review gave a brief about the two regional education innovation Networks in Asia and Africa.

In order to acquaint the international, regional, and national institutions outside the Arab States wiht the Regional Network for Education Innovation for Development in the Arab States, the contents of this special issue were translated into French and English.

e) Regarding the Financial and Technical Resources of the Programme

Up to the moment of writing this report, the programme has been relying almost completely on Unesco Regular Budget. Arab States have shown their willingness to support their national institutions that are going to be associated with the programme. Also, they have shown their willingness to host some regional and sub-regional activities next year. Details on this subject will be discussed in EIPDAS Second Consultative Meeting which is planned to take place in Beirut next November (1980). In the meantime, negotiations with UNDP and some concerned Arab funds to finance some activities of the programme are still going on.

V. Network of Educational Innovation for Development in Africa (NEIDA)

Mr. O. Ogunniyi, Coordinator of NEIDA, presented NEIDA within the context of "educational innovation for development".

African leaders have long recognised education as an important factor of social, economic and cultural development. As a result, many African countries have, since independence, made impressive efforts to develop it with these purposes in view. These efforts have, however, frequently led to more pressing challenges, arising out of the realisation that a high percentage of school-aged children are still not being educated, that the costs of education have become unbearably high, that unemployment among school-leavers has become a common phenomenon and that the drift to cities has tended to increase, aggravating social problems.

As a consequence, the need for transforming implanted educational systems into effective instruments for remedying these ills and positively promoting development has led to fundamental educational reforms and, in the process, to the introduction of innovative ideas and practices in many areas.

It is within this context that the Ministers of Education of African Member States, meeting in Lagos, Nigeria, in 1967, invited the Director-General of Unesco to establish an African Network which would be responsible for stimulating and supporting educational innovations oriented towards development.

Their conviction, in making this request, was their continued faith in the possible contributions of education to development, and the fact that there were, within the African region, enough common development issues, similarity of problems and relevant experience in solving them to make a programme of regional cooperation in the development and exchange of experiences in educational innovations viable and profitable.

Unesco responded to the Ministers' request and set up the Network, designed as an "Inter-African cooperative network for exchanges between national, sub-regional and regional institutions responsible for promoting educational innovation for development", which became operational in October 1978.

In view of the level of development in many African countries, development is considered the highest priority. Thus, for NEIDA, educational innovation is not an end in itself ; rather, it is a means for meeting a challenge or solving a problem which relates to development. A term which implies the improvement of all aspects of the lives of human being. As a result, NEIDA aims at using education as a means for enhancing human potential so as to enable each and every member of society to contribute to, and participate more fully in the life of the community. Quality of life, social equity and cultural identity are among its main objectives.

Selectivity to ensure educational innovation for development

Considering the vastness of the field covered by education, the complexity of the education process itself, the number of countries participating in the NEIDA programme and the multiplicity of innovative ideas and projects in each of these countries, NEIDA has perforce to be selective in :

- the choice of its programme areas in confirmity with the common areas of development and educational priorities in participating countries ;

- the quality and relevance of the projects it includes in the network, which have to be innovative and designed to support development ; as well as in

- the form of action and exchange, in order to ensure that available resources are effectively used for inter-country development cooperation.

Programme areas

As stated above, the objective of development runs through the field of action of NEIDA for the first cycle (1978-1981). These are :

1. Education and productive work,

2. Education for development in rural areas,

3. Administration and supervision of educational systems,

4. Training and retraining of educational personnel,

5. Production and distribution of teaching materials,

6. Use of national languages in education.

Two of these areas (items 1 and 2) have been identified as priority concerns of African countries, in their attempt to relate education to development. Three of them, numbers 3 to 5, have been selected as the most crucial areas of education which need to be innovated in many participating countries to enable education to contribute more effectively to the development priority areas. And, finally, the intimate relationship which exists between national languages and cultural development justifies the choice of national languages in education as an area of particular interest and concern on the part of African countries.

Operational activities

The operational activities of NEIDA have a dual purpose. They are either oriented towards the strengthening of the infrastructure which enables NEIDA to function effectively, or they are concerned with improving the substance of the NEIDA programme, that is , enhancing the appropriateness and the quality of the innovations which are taking place.

For NEIDA, the best way to promote a useful exchange of ideas and experiences is to establish direct contacts between the specialists working in the various innovative projects. The aim goes beyond the exchange of information to active cooperation and mutual help in the interest of self-reliance. For this reason, all NEIDA activities are geared towards maximising exchange of ideas and experiences.

Institutional Mechanism

The various organs for carrying out NEIDA activities include Associated projects, National Coordinating Centres, the NEIDA Coordinating Unit, and Regional Consultation Meetings.

Associated projects are the elements where innovation takes place and, therefore, the nuclei of the entire system. NEIDA aims at promoting inter-action through seminars, inter-projects visits, attachments, workshops, etc., between these projects to ensure that experience gained in them reaches the widest possible audience of educators in Africa.

In each participating country, there is a National Coordinating Centre which coordinates and promotes NEIDA activities within the country and serves as a link between the NEIDA Coordinating Unit in BREDA and the Associated projects. It organises information services in support of NEIDA activities at national level. As members of the Regional Consultation Meeting, the National Coordinators participate fully in the shaping, planning and reviewing of the NEIDA programme, thus ensuring that NEIDA activities faithfully reflect the needs and aspirations of participating countries.

The NEIDA Coordinating Unit, which is part of the Unesco Regional Office for Education in Africa, in Dakar, acts as a unifying force in the entire network. It services and monitors all NEIDA activities, organises and facilitates exchange of ideas, experience and expertise among the various organs of the network, performs the function of a catalyser in the promotion and improvement of innovative experiences, and is the central information service of the network.

Regional Consultation Meetings, composed of high officials invited in their personal capacity from participating Member States are convened annually by the Director-General of Unesco to advise on the direction that NEIDA should take, to make proposals for the nature and vocation of activities and to review progress.

Thus, the Regional Consultation Meeting constitutes a forum for developing cooperative programmes and for monitoring NEIDA activities with a view to relating them more directly to the needs and priorities of participating countries.

Problems and Future Development

Future developments have to be viewed against a background of past achievements and conceived objectives.

NEIDA has expanded its operation very rapidly during its first year in response to the demand of African countries, so much so that it now has about 100 Associated projects in 24 participating countries. The challenge here is how to get these Associated Projects participate effectively in NEIDA activities in view of the resources available and the optimum number of participants that could be brought together at any particular time for profitable exchange of experience and knowledge.

Secondly, the success of NEIDA and the meeting of its objectives depends largely on the activities at national level. The exchange of experience and the analysis of problems is only a beginning ; the final application of the acquired knowledge in the development process and the wider dissemination of results can only be achieved if, at the national level, strong institutions and organisations participate actively in NEIDA operations. It is, therefore, considered as a priority for the future to strengthen the Associated Projects and the National Coordinating Centres through training and technical support. In addition, ways and means will be sought to encourage more activities at national level.

Thirdly, in order to ensure that NEIDA activities have maximum impact on national development, future actions at all levels and in all their phases (policy, planning and implementation) will be organised in a multidisciplinary approach, where specialists from ministries/departments concerned with education and development will participate jointly in NEIDA activities. This also requires the promotion of awareness of NEIDA programmes in these other relevant ministries/departments.

Lastly, but not least, NEIDA will continue to extend its services to all countries in the region and encourage the establishment of National Coordinating Centres in the countries where such centres are not yet in existence.

VI. Network of Educational Systems for Development in Central America and Panama (RED)

Mr. Bernède, ex-coordinator of RED, reported as follows :

The project "Network of educational systems for development in Central America and Panama" was born in 1975 from a joint initiative of the Ministers of Education of the subregion working together within the Central American Educational Coordination (CEC), of UNDP and of UNESCO. The purpose of the project was to build and develop a network of technical cooperation, human resources exchange and information sharing, aiming at supporting the coordination and mutual cooperation efforts of the six countries in the field of education.

The network was not build upon educational innovation, but rather organized around the concept of the contribution of educational systems to the specific development of each participating country. During the life of the project, the educational innovations stemmed out either from each national educational system, or from national or subregional institutions such as the Central American Institute for Educational Administration and Supervision (ICASE - Panama) or from pilot studies or experiments jointly developped by various countries within the framework of the network.

A mechanism was set up in order to create and operate communication channels between national institutions and human resources involved in educational research and development, either in official or non-governmental circles. In the design and modalities of operations of the network, the socio-political concept played a very important part. Thus, in Nicaragua, the network could contribute to mobilize rapidly the technical cooperation resources which could collaborate in the design and implementation of a new educational system ; in other countries, it made possible a process of valorizing at subregional level innovative educational experiments of an innovative nature but limited by their national context. In other cases, the network contributed

directly to improvement of a national educational system in key aspects such as participatory training of teachers and administrators, curriculum development based on basic needs of the communities, etc...

Annexes

Annex I.

Programme

1. Opening session : Introduction.

2. Consideration of the provisional time table.

3. Mutual presentation of different networks (APEID, NEIDA, EIPDAS, RED and CODIESEE).

4. Clarification of the concept "educational innovations for development".

5. Common elements to be considered in developing evaluation methods for each network.

6. Modalities of direct exchanges of persons and experience between networks.

7. Consideration of common activities related to the promotion of cooperative programmes of educational innovation for development for 1981-1983 under Unesco programme.

8. Conclusion and closing session.

Annex II.

List of Participants

APEID
(Asian Programme of Educational Innovation for Development)
(Programme asiatique d'innovation éducative en vue du développement)

- Yung Dug Lee, Korean Educational Development Institute, 20-1 Umyeon-Dong, Gangnam-Gu, Seoul, Republic of Korea.

- Minda Sutaria, Director, Bureau of Elementary Education, Ministry of Education and Culture, Manila, Philippines.

- A. Latif, Chief, Asian Centre of Educational Innovation for Development.

CARNEID
(Caribbean Network of Educational Innovation for Development)
(Réseau d'innovation éducative pour le développement des Caraïbes)

- G. Young, ED/OPS

CODIESEE
(Cooperation in Development of Educational Innovation for Development in South East Europe)
(Coopération pour le développement de l'innovation éducative dans le Sud-Est de l'Europe)

- Dimitar Tzvetkov, Centre de Recherches sur l'Education, 125 Bld Lénine, bl. V, Sofia, Bulgarie.

- A. Isaksson, Coordinator, CODIESEE

EIPDAS
(Educational Innovation Programme for Development in Arab States)
(Programme d'innovations éducatives en vue du développement dans les Etats Arabes)

- Issam Hassoun, Ministry of Education, Khartoum, Sudan.

- A. El Ghannam, Coordinator, EIPDAS.

NEIDA
(Network of Educational Innovation for Development in Africa)
(Réseau d'innovation éducative pour le développement en Afrique)

- S.Y. Cissé, Ministère de l'Education nationale, B.P. 4025, Dakar, Sénégal.

- O. Ogunniyi, Coordinator, NFIDA

RED
(Network of Educational Systems for Development in Central America and Panama)
(Réseau de systèmes éducatifs pour le développement en Amérique centrale et au Panama)

- Juan Bosco Bernal, ICASE, Université de Panama, Estafeta universitaria. Panama 5, Panama.

- Miguel de Castilla, Ministère de l'Education, Managua, Nicaragua.

- François Bernède, Coordinator, RED

Representative of the Director-General of Unesco

- H. Foecke, - DADG/ED/PRG

Division for Study of Development
Division de l'étude du développement

International Bureau of Education (IBE)
Bureau international d'éducation (BIE)

- J.B. Chandler, Director, IBE.

International Institute of Educational Planning (IIEP)
Institut international de planification de l'éducation (IIPE)

- S. Hassekh

Division of Structures, Contents, Methods and Techniques of Education
Division des Structures, Contenus, Méthodes et Techniques de l'Education (ED/SCM)

- H. Dieuzeide, Director, ED/SCM

- E. Brunswic, Chief, ED/SCM/MMT

- W. McLeod, ED/SCM/MMT

- M. Saulière, ED/SCM/MMT

- D. Piazzoli, ED/SCM/MMT

- G. Berger, Consultant.

Annex III.

List of Documents

Working documents

ED/SCM/INS/80/1	Programme and Time-table.
ED/SCM/INS/80/2	Annotated programme.
ED/SCM/INS/80/3	Educational innovations for development.
ED/SCM/INS/80/4	Evaluation design proposal for networks of educational innovation for development.
ED/SCM/INS/80/5	Development of guidelines and methods of evaluating the second cycle programme of APEID.
ED/SCM/INS/80/6	Extract of the draft programme and budget of Unesco for 1981-83, objective 5.4, item 1.
ED/SCM/INS/80/7	List of documents.
ED/SCM/INS/80/8	Provisional list of participants.

Reference documents

ED/SCM/INS/80/REF/1	Asian Programme of Educational Innovation for Development (APEID).
ED/SCM/INS/80/REF/2	Network of Educational Innovation for Development in Africa (NEIDA).
ED/SCM/INS/80/REF/3	Educational Innovation Programme for Development in Arab States (EIPDAS).
ED/SCM/INS/80/REF/4	Network of Education for Development in Central America including Panama (RED).
ED/SCM/INS/80/REF/5	Cooperation for the development of educational innovation in the South-East European Region (CODIESEE).
ED/SCM/INS/80/REF/6	Transfer of knowledge for an endogenous development.
ED/SCM/INS/80/REF/7	Some comments on the socio-economic context of development and its influence on the evolution of content of education during the next two decades.
ED/SCM/INS/80/REF/8	Indicators of Social and Economic Change and Their Applications.